

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JAN 21 1952

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

October 1951

CHILD WELFARE



JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

VOLUME XXX • NUMBER 8

price 35 cents

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N.Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Long Time Temporary Placement	3
Editorial Comments	
Your Community Chest	10
Katharine F. Lenroot	10
A Board Member Speaks	
How a Women's Auxiliary Can Help Children	12
Classification Plan and Salary Scale for Teachers in Day Care Centers	14
Book Note	17
Classified Ad Service	18

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, Board Member, Children's Aid Association, Boston, Mass.

Policy Committee

MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS
E. MARGUERITE GANE

MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER
MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK

REV. JOHN J. LENNON
SOPHIE VAN S. THEIS

Advisory Committee

SALLIE E. BRIGHT Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.
MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
HYMAN GROSSBARD Clinical Director, Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School, Hawthorne, N. Y.
DR. ROMAN L. HAREMSKI Director, Children's Division, City of Chicago Department of Welfare, Chicago, Ill.
DOROTHY HUTCHINSON Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.
ADELAIDE KAISER Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.
FRIEDA M. KUHLMANN Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Society, Newark, N. J.
MARY LOIS PYLES Consultant, U.S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.
FRED A. SCHUMACHER Executive Director, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
VERNE WEED Assistant Executive Director, Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.
RUTH WEISENBARGER Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, New York, N. Y.
HELEN M. WHEELER Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass.

LONG TIME TEMPORARY PLACEMENT*

Mary E. Lewis

Supervisor of Child Welfare
State Department of Economic Security
Frankfort, Kentucky

Discussion by:

Ellery C. Russel

Chief Social Worker, Adoption Research Study
Yale University Child Study Center
New Haven, Connecticut

What are we to do about children who are "living in one place and loving in another"? What has happened in long time temporary care that most of the parents have been lost to the children and the children to them? Some of the reasons why we fail in this area, and what can be done about it, are presented in this straightforward paper and discussion.

SEVERAL years ago Henrietta Gordon, in speaking of children in long time temporary placement, referred to them as children "living in one place and loving in another." What better way to describe Johnny, who has lived five years in a children's institution because the community frowns on his father's bootlegging and his mother's boyfriends, even though both parents love Johnny dearly and want him home? Or Jennie, who has lived in four different boarding homes in as many years? All the boarding parents were kind and loving, but she longed to be home with her daddy who could not make quite enough money to pay for a housekeeper. Johnny and Jennie truly are "living in one place and loving in another."

Agencies know many other Johnnys and Jennies whose parents cannot keep them for some reason or whose parents are not permitted to keep them because a court has said they are not fit parents. These are the children we prosaically say are "children in long time temporary placement." What do we mean by this phrase? The very terms are contradictory. Perhaps they indicate our confusion about how to help these children better than they define the type of care the children are receiving. We have never precisely defined the phrase for ourselves, but for the purposes of this paper it will describe those children who have been living in some kind of temporary foster placement for a period of over two years with no plan for change in the foreseeable future. This paper is concerned with the number of those children, what happens to them and their parents, why this happens and what we can do about it.

One might ask if there are really so many children in long time temporary placement. Let us look at some figures. Last year 14 child welfare agencies in the southern region found that 20 per cent of the nearly 4,000 children in temporary foster placement had been in such care for over five years. In April,

1950, my own agency was caring for 156 children in boarding homes. Thirty-eight per cent had been in care for over two years. Two hundred and forty-eight children were in institutions. Fifty-five per cent had been in care for more than two years, and 19 per cent for five years or more.

These are small samples. Unfortunately we do not have figures for the entire country. But these samples are indicative of the many thousands of children in our country who live year after year in institutions or with families not their own.

Few Children Thrive in This Set-up

And what does happen to these children? There are as many individual reactions as there are children, but whatever the reaction, it is generally one that militates against a good adjustment to life. It is true that a few children, but very few, seem able to grow and thrive in this situation. They love their own parents and their foster parents, too, without much disturbance at having a dual kind of parentage. And it is good that this is so, because with the knowledge, skills and resources which we now have, there are some children for whom long time temporary placement is indicated. There are children without relatives to care for them, sometimes handicapped in one way or another, for whom our best skills have not been able to find permanent homes. There are children who have lost one parent and whose other parent must work away from home during the years a child is too young to stay alone. There are children whom we with our present knowledge cannot help to move on to a permanent home.

But the ordinary picture is that of a child bewildered by a situation beyond his control and seemingly that of his parents; not clear why he cannot be with his own parents nor why he was forced to leave them; sometimes guilty because he feels his actions caused the separation; sometimes showing or suppressing great hostility to parents because of their

* Presented at League's program, National Conference of Social Work, Atlantic City, 1951.

rejection of him; sometimes blaming the agency, which he sees as the cause of the separation. Many of these children are unable to move into a relationship with foster parents because they cannot work through their feelings about the separation from their own parents; frequently their feelings of hostility are so strong that they can neither live with their own parents nor let them go.

Among the reactions our workers have had from children are:

Have I done something terrible to be taken away from my parents? Is it my fault we cannot be together?

Don't my parents really want me? They keep saying they do, but why don't they do something about it? I know my father is sick all the time and Mom has to work, but Jimmy's parents are in the same boat and some way they manage to stay together.

And to one of the workers at our institution:

Are you the lady that puts us out of here? I don't want to go—I'm afraid.

And at the same institution the child who begged day after day:

Can't you find me a home with a mommy and daddy like the other kids have?

Some of the children are not so outspoken: they are well-behaved and conforming, apparently happy in the foster home or institution. These children may be almost forgotten by the worker or the community until suddenly there is an explosion, an episode of stealing, truancy or the like. Or the time comes when a child could go back to his parents, but he suddenly realizes that to him they no longer are his parents and he is afraid. Or perhaps the child is old enough to take on the responsibilities of young adulthood, but we then find he cannot do so.

What has happened to the parents in these years is almost as tragic as what has happened to the children—and it has played an important part in the tragedy of the children. Somewhere along the way most of them have been lost to the children and the children to them. They have gradually drifted away, lost interest in children for whom they are assuming little or no responsibility, or have been actively pushed away by workers and foster parents unaware of the real need of children for their parents. A few are still in the picture, kept there by their own love for their children or by workers understanding enough to know the real value of parents to children.

We Do Not Really Know How to Help

It is a sorry picture. Why does this happen to children? Aren't placements made by well-trained, highly skilled child welfare workers? Of course, the truth is that some are and some are not. But a further truth, and one more difficult for us to look at, is that as a

whole, trained and untrained, highly skilled or unskilled, we as child welfare workers have not yet demonstrated that we know how to help these children and their parents. We are somewhat in the position of "all the king's horses and all the king's men." We have found it appallingly easy to break up families but very, very difficult to put them back together again.

The reasons we fail are legion, but three stand out—lack of knowledge, lack of resources, and failure to make the best use of the knowledge we have. We do need further knowledge. We need to know more about helping natural parents to be better parents while children are still in the home. We need more knowledge to enable us to better assess the potentialities of parents, either to keep their children or to give them up. We are still not clear on what separation may mean to children and their parents. We need to know more about helping parents and children use placement to the best advantage. We need to learn how to help children whose parents are permanently lost to them move on to permanent foster placement. All of this means that research is greatly needed in our field. There is a wealth of material in our case records—much of it negative, it is true, but still material that could be used to set up better guideposts than the ones we are using today.

It Is Hard to Find the Right Home

There is one other area in which we seem particularly to need new knowledge and new skills. That is in finding adoptive homes for older and handicapped children who have lost their own parents. Probably most of you have had the same experience that our Division has had of needing a home for such a child, but of being completely baffled about finding one. At the same time a newspaper may run a small item about a similar child who needs a home and the offers pour in. It is true that many of the homes the newspapers find are not the right ones; still, some of them are. And we need to learn how to find them too.

And then we do not have all of the resources we need to help parents and children who come to us. All of the skill in the world at intake and in planning with parents will not take the place of adequate community resources. Community understanding of the value of a child's own home is a resource sadly lacking in many of our counties and cities. When parents need financial help and the community will provide only a certain percentage of a minimum budget—sometimes as low as 50%—casework services cannot make up the difference. Casework cannot provide the food, shelter, and medical care to keep a child healthy and well or the soap to keep him clean. Many families

founder on this financial problem. A twelve-year-old may need warm, understanding boarding parents, skilled in working with difficult adolescents. Because of boarding home shortages, he is placed in a boarding home particularly good with infants. Or a child may need an institution which can offer skilled psychiatric services, yet have to be placed in one which offers nothing but adequate custodial care. Is it any wonder that many children do not use placement in such a way that they may be returned to their own homes within a reasonably short time?

We do not have enough knowledge and we lack resources. But we must confess that we do not make the best use of the knowledge we have. As one reads the records of these placements, it is clear that we are not using the knowledge and skills which the profession has developed. We know that the point of intake is the most critical one, and that it is here that success or failure is almost determined. But we find hasty planning or no planning. In neglect situations, placement is frequently seized on as the "easy" solution without exploration of the strengths of the family to keep children. As one of our consultants phrased it, it seems so much easier for workers to play chess with the family members than to help them work out their difficulties together.

We know that a child moves into placement with less damage if he is taken step by step along the way. But there are glaring examples of failure to tell children they were being placed until the actual moment of placement. We know that children can accept reality with help and that they need to know what the reality is. But we find some children after many years of placement who have never talked with their social worker about the reasons their parents could not keep them.

Parents Are Kept Out of Picture

The list is almost endless—we know children need their parents, and that parents should retain all the responsibility they can. Yet we deny parents the right to see children, we fail to help them to be responsible. Some will not allow parents to pay for care because it might give them the right to feel that they should have some voice in planning.

Perhaps a few agencies and a few workers are using all that is known of good child welfare practice, but most are not. There is an unevenness of skill in our workers, supervisors and administrators. We are still a profession employing untrained or partially trained workers. Heavy caseloads are the rule rather than the exception. Particularly in rural areas workers have administrative and community responsibilities that take away from the time given to casework. And when time is short, it is the need for careful planning

and the need to be constantly aware of what is happening to individual children, that the workers are prone to forget.

Sometimes, too, one wonders if we are convinced that the knowledge we have is truly sound. For example, we say that many of the children who are in long time temporary placement should never have been removed from their homes, that the real need was effective work with the parents and the children in the home, not foster care. As a profession we talk and write about this service as the basic one, but our actions frequently belie our words. Compare the number of child welfare agencies, both public and private, which have consultants for foster care with those which have consultants on work with children in their own homes. I know of one state that has a consultant of the latter type in its organization plan, but I know of no state that actually has one. The U. S. Children's Bureau has had foster care consultants for many years, but in just the last three or four years has it had one for work with children in their own homes. Yet we all know the real impetus that can be given one phase of work by having a consultant on the staff whose sole responsibility is the development of that particular program.

Lack of knowledge, lack of resources and failure to make the best use of the knowledge we have—a formidable trio. But we are not justified in taking refuge in the first two. We can tackle right now ways to make the best use of the knowledge we have. In first considering what we can do, we might think that we were faced with two quite evident problems: What can we do with the children already in long time temporary placement and what can we do about those children just coming to the agencies for care? But on second consideration this would seem to be making it too simple. Certainly those are the children we must think about. But for the solution perhaps we must look to ourselves.

Are we really concerned about what is happening to these children? Do we believe that his own home is the best home for a child? Do we honestly believe that all children have a right to a home of their own? As a profession I believe we are struggling to get square on these points. We are thinking and writing and talking about them, and this is good. But we have not yet mobilized our concern, knowledge and skills to help the individual worker in her day-by-day job. As a practical matter, much of this mobilization will have to be done agency by agency.

Administrative Responsibility for Service

In each agency concern about these children must be felt from the top down and from the bottom up.

It is the responsibility of each administrator to have knowledge of the number of children in his agency in long time temporary placement and to be concerned about what is happening to them. It is almost certain that when he has knowledge he will have concern—on a financial basis if no other! He must then spread throughout his staff his sense of concern about these children and those coming into care. This is the first step and without it nothing can be done. The ultimate responsibility for an agency program rests with an administrator, but the actual work with a child and his parents is done by a caseworker. All the concern at the top makes little difference until that concern is felt by the worker responsible for a particular child. It is to the worker that Sally's parents come to request placement. It is to the worker that Sally and her parents must look for help if Sally is to go back home again. To the rest of the agency Sally may be only a statistic, one more child in foster care, but to the worker she must be a particular child, with particular problems, in need of particular help. If she is not, she will not receive that particular help.

There are various ways of spreading this concern throughout the staff. It can be done by means of workshops and institutes which bring out what happens to children in long time temporary placement, and by supervisory conferences in which the worker's own cases are discussed.

Why Not Use "Alarm Clocks"?

In addition, administrative controls and processes can be used to help the staff be constantly aware of individual children, either those coming into care or those already in long time temporary placement. Social workers balk at administrative devices or controls—we seem to be so afraid of them. But we use alarm clocks to help us get up on time in the morning. Many of us wake up without them, but we use them just to be certain. Then why not use alarm clocks to make certain that children do not go hastily into placement or remain too long in care.

One alarm clock can be the use of treatment plans—dictated into the record and discussed with the supervisor. In our agency within six weeks of the referral the worker must write in the record an initial treatment plan. Thereafter treatment plans are re-evaluated at intervals not to exceed six months. In this way an administrative device is used to help a worker plan at the beginning, and consistently thereafter, not allowing her to drift for long periods.

Another alarm clock we are using is a monthly statistical report of all children in foster care, giving the type of care and the length of time in such care.

Each worker prepares this report for her own caseload and in doing so is reminded of the Johnnys and Jennies who are staying too long in care.

These are all ways of helping the worker to be aware and concerned about the children. But awareness and concern are not enough. The staff must have knowledge of ways of helping children and parents. It is most frustrating to workers to know that they are failing children and parents, but not to know what help to give or how to give it. Faced with the necessity of planning for children, one can almost see them freeze into inactivity. It is the administrator's responsibility to see that the staff has this knowledge.

Workers seem to need help in almost all phases of working with parents and their children. Actually it seems clear that the problem of children in long time temporary placement is not just that—it cuts across all of the work of the agency: intake, working with parents and children in their own homes (particularly in protective situations), working with children in placement and with their parents, foster home finding. As we are unsuccessful in any of these, we may cause children needlessly to remain in long time temporary placement.

Supervisory conferences and an in-service training program of workshops and institutes are the most effective methods of on-the-job training we have found. For a given period an agency must select certain aspects of the job for training. My own agency selected two. We conducted a series of workshops on work with children in their own homes, with particular emphasis on protective services, since many of our referrals were in this category. Special attention was given to what happened at intake, as we believed many cases were lost through haphazard planning at that point. The other series of workshops was on helping older children move into placement. We had found our workers were very fearful of this.

For two years our Division has been working on the problem of children in long time temporary placement, giving help to the workers through supervisory conferences, through in-service training, and through use of the administrative devices mentioned above. This has been done at a time when we were having many administrative changes, so that all of our energies could not be devoted to it. Did we get results? We believe we did. During the ten months we have kept statistics on the length of time children have been in boarding home care, there has been a gradual, consistent drop in the number who have remained in care for over two years. At the end of April, 1950, there were 67 children over six in boarding homes. Forty of those children had been in care for over two years. Nine months later there were 86

children over six in boarding homes. Only 28 of those children had been in care for over two years.

These Children's Lives Were Changed

Statistics are cold, but translated into individual children they can be heartwarming. For Joe, who was perhaps two per cent of those statistics, it meant a lifetime of security and happiness with parents all his own. Not his natural parents, but still his own. For Mary, another two per cent, it meant a return to parents who had loved her enough to change their ways of living so that Mary could come home.

Long time temporary placement is too big a subject to be covered in one paper. Our inadequacies are too many, the things we must do too numerous to be examined in such a short time. But at the risk of oversimplifying, perhaps the answer to long time temporary placement can be given in four words—do away with it. We must believe that for every child there is a home. We must seek the way to keep him there or to find one for him.

DISCUSSION

By Ellery C. Russel

After reading Miss Lewis' paper with a great deal of interest, I read it a second time in the hope that I could find some controversial point with which I could take issue. However, I cannot honestly disagree with any of her points. Certainly her concluding statement that long time temporary placement should be "done away with" is a conclusion to which I can also subscribe, with, however, one important addition, and also perhaps one qualification. Miss Lewis has spoken particularly about the group of children who could be returned to their parents or relatives, but whose return may be delayed by long time temporary placement. I would like to add, and to speak particularly about, the group of children, usually babies, who cannot return to their own parents, but who need *new* parents. These are the babies and children, usually of unmarried mothers, who are eligible for adoption in terms of the mother's willingness to release them, but whose placement in adoption homes is delayed until they are considered to be eligible in terms of their own normal development.

We do not usually think of ourselves as giving these children long time care—perhaps not even long time temporary care. But this is an opinion about our practice which I think we need to examine, for it may be possible that for a baby who is waiting for a real

mother of his own, even six months may be a long time temporary placement.

What happens to these children during the time they are awaiting permanent placement is the question we need to answer for ourselves.

Effect of Foster Care on Development

At the Child Study Center we have records of many children whose mothers were willing to release them for adoption, and who were brought to the Clinic to see if they were eligible in terms of their intellectual equipment. Most of these children had already been in foster care when they were brought in for the first exam. Some of them failed to qualify for adoption on the basis of that examination and had to be continued in foster care for a period of years. They were brought back to the Clinic for periodic examinations in the hope that they might show improvement and become eligible for adoption. In some instances this did happen. I would like to tell you briefly about the record of one of these children.

Janey had five psychological exams at the Clinic over a period of about three years. They ranged from a rating of Borderline Defective to a rate of Average. She was in four foster homes during this period of time and in one institution. Janey was born in a maternity home on April 6, 1943. Her mother had gone there late in her pregnancy. Janey stayed here with her mother until July 8, 1943. At this time, when she was three months old, she was placed in a foster home. When she was five months old and still in this first foster home, she had her first psychological examination. At this time the psychologist was not able to make a definite diagnosis of her intellectual capacity because she was so fretful and restless during the examination. He reported that it was his impression that her intelligence was within the normal range, but that her personality make-up was limited and some of her behavior so atypical that he could not recommend her for adoption at that time.

Shortly after this examination and after she had been in this foster home for three months, she had to be placed in a second foster home. The reasons for this were quite beyond agency control. In the second foster home, it was reported that she made an "immediate adjustment," did not cry much, and was a "very good baby."

When she was seven months old, after being in this foster home for one month, she was brought back for her second test. This time it was noted that she was extremely docile, but had made practically no developmental progress since the last test. At the age of 28 weeks her performance was at the 16 weeks level. It was felt that the developmental outlook for her was Defective.

To make sure, however, she was brought in for another test one month later, when she was eight months old. She was still in the same foster home and was a "good baby." At this time she was definitely diagnosed as being subnormal with inferior mental endowment and the retardation was considered too serious to permit a recommendation for adoption.

After these three tests, she was considered not to be adoptable. At the age of 13 months, she was placed in what was termed a permanent boarding home. When she reached the age of 21 months (after being in this home for eight months) she had shown so much

improvement that she was brought back for a fourth test. At this time she was still docile and her performance was considered to be unimaginative, but her developmental level had exactly equaled her chronological age, so that in terms of I.Q. she scored an even 100! At this time her limitation remained only in the area of personality. It was reported that when confronted with a strange situation "she remained motionless," but that she could take help.

Following this examination, and at the age of two years, she was finally placed in her fourth home, but this time it was an adoptive home. When she was two years and nine months old, she had her last examination. She still turned in a good average performance and was described as "a well-developed, blond, friendly, attractive little girl. Her adjustment to the examination was mature and stable. Her interest and attention were well-sustained. There was no evidence of inhibition. The quality of the whole performance was quite good."

This is a tribute to the faith and patience and awareness of the agency in finally getting this little girl into an adoptive home. But when we consider the time, effort and money that went into this, I think we must ask ourselves whether all this was unavoidable. In the first examination there was some indication that this child had normal intellectual capacity. For some reason her ability to use this was lost. On the surface the foster homes in which she was placed were good and on the surface her adjustment to them was good. On the basis of her "good adjustment" in these "good homes," her performance on the tests was considered to be an accurate measure of her ability. But there was something lacking which made it impossible for her to use the innate ability which she had. In examining what caused the fluctuation in this child's psychological score, we need to consider the possible connection between this and the extended period of her temporary care. Possibly for this baby, even five months without a real mother was too long a placement.

Babies Suffer Most by Separation

For these children who are still babies, and who are developing at a more rapid rate than older children, the time span of six months is much longer than for older children, in terms of what happens to them during that time. It is perhaps even worse for these children than for older children to have postponed the opportunity of establishing permanent family relationships. These children do not "live in one place and love in another," as Mrs. Gordon has so aptly described foster children separated from their own parents. These children love and are loved only by the temporary foster parents from whom they must be separated sooner or later.

We are only beginning to learn what the breaking up of these early relationships, and the necessity of forming new relationships, does to the development of a child's personality and to his ability to function

as revealed by his performance on psychological examinations. How long it takes for these new relationships to provide the same emotional security as the first relationship is one of the things about which we still know very little. There may even be a question as to whether a broken early relationship may permanently impair, to some degree, a child's subsequent development, either emotionally or intellectually.

The film, "Grief in Infancy," produced by Dr. Katherine Wolf and Dr. Rene Spitz, and which many of you may have seen, throws some light on what early separation from the mother may mean to an infant. This film was made at a state reformatory for women where babies were separated from their mothers at a very early age. Dr. Wolf and Dr. Spitz gave psychological examinations to these babies and photographed them before the separation from their mothers and again after the separation. After the children had been reunited with their mothers, they were tested and photographed again.

In general, the performance of all the babies on the psychological examinations showed a very decided drop after the separation from the mothers. The films also revealed the change in facial expression and activity which took place after the separation. There was much less smiling and many of the expressions took on a bland, if not blank, appearance. After being reunited with their mothers, the babies' performance on the tests rose again, although it was sometimes very slow in reaching the original level of performance and, in some cases, never attained the original level of performance at all. The age at which the separation took place and the length of time of the separation were contributing factors, of course. The earlier the separation took place, the more damaging it seemed to be, since it appeared that these babies not only had lost the object of a relationship, but when they were so young as not to be able to distinguish their mother as a person apart from themselves, it was as if they had lost a part of themselves which they never could regain. In the light of the changes which extended foster care may involve, this takes on great significance for us in the child placing field.

All children may not react with the same intensity to these experiences. Also, some children apparently react with a personality disorganization, while others react with a psychological deviation. I believe we have more evidence concerning the effect of deprivation of normal family relationships on emotional development. However, some of the records at our Clinic, as well as some of the research which Dr. Wolf has done, certainly indicates the possible effect of separations and postponed permanent placement on mental development. When we see this kind of

evidence concerning the possible damage which may occur to the psychological development of a child, it puts a grave responsibility upon those of us whose job it is to provide foster care for children.

Burden Placed on Foster Parents

The other part of this picture of long time temporary placement for the group of children of whom I am speaking concerns what happens when we try to make up to a child what he has already lost. At this time we have the problem of interpreting to prospective adoptive parents what has happened to a child during his early years and why. We ask adoptive parents to accept him as he is, without their having had any previous experience with him. Most adoptive parents at the time they take a baby for adoption expect to take him for better or worse, and are prepared to care for him even though he may develop physical or emotional problems. However, we ask much more of adoptive parents when we expect them to handle such problems without having a basis of a previous relationship with the child.

Experience of Catholic Home Bureau

The article in the April issue of *Social Casework* by Helen W. Hallinan, Supervisor of the Adoption Department of the Catholic Home Bureau of New York, points up this dilemma of an adoption agency. Many agencies find themselves now with older children who have been released for adoption by the parents, but who have developed physical, emotional or psychological difficulties which make them difficult to place. Most agencies have more adoption applicants than children in the lower age range, but more children than applicants in the upper age range. It seems possible that, with the best intentions, we have postponed placing children with the result that they have developed problems making them too difficult to place.

The experience of the Catholic Home Bureau in New York, which has now placed 101 babies at a very early age with the result that only one has needed to be removed because of mental deficiency, is interesting and valuable not only in terms of providing good life experiences for these children, but also because it takes on the aspect of a research experiment in showing what can be done with early placements.

I spoke earlier of a qualification to Miss Lewis' comments on long time temporary placements. I would simply like to say that in some instances long time care may really be necessary. There may always be some children who because of conditions either within themselves or within their family can neither

return to their natural parents nor be placed with new parents. For these children, the difference between the damaging effect of long time temporary placement and the value of it, may lie in our recognition and acceptance of it and in our ability to help the child to recognize and accept this fact, too. This is very hard for any caseworker and for any child. And it also places added responsibility on the caseworker to determine if this is really necessary. Perhaps if we really accept the responsibility of making this decision and then of helping a child to live with it, it may even heighten our imagination and ability to make another plan if possible. But if and when long time care is really necessary, let us have the courage to face it and help a child to face it.

Lastly, in considering what has prevented us from doing a better job with these situations, it seems to me it is not so much a matter of lack of resources, as it is lack of knowledge and lack of conviction about what we are doing. It does not seem too surprising that we have had a lack of conviction. In the development of personality and psychological ability, there is often a considerable lapse of time between the cause and effect of certain phenomena. And for this reason the underlying cause is not always immediately apparent. However, we are now beginning to have evidence of some of these causal relationships. Our evidence may never be as definite and exact as that of some other professions because human personality, with which we work, is so fluid. But we are constantly adding to a growing body of knowledge concerning the specific effect of certain experiences upon the development of children. As we gain more knowledge, it places more responsibility upon us, but it also gives us more conviction about the use of that knowledge. And as we gain conviction about what should or should not be done, we will find the necessary resources with which to do it.

There is not time to go into the specific agency procedures which will make it possible for us to be more effective in carrying out our purpose. Miss Lewis' system of "alarm clocks" is one method. Clarifying agency policy, and interpreting this to clients so that they may know at the point of intake what they may expect from the agency, may also be very helpful in aiding a parent to come to grips with his problem.

Some Soul-Searching Needed

And let us not overlook the importance of examining our own attitudes with respect to such things as whether, for example, we have an underlying belief that foster homes are better than natural homes, and

(Continued on page 13)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Your Community Chest

ON the cover of this issue is a symbol that is familiar to all of us—the Red Feather. For a large percentage of the child welfare agencies in the country it represents the main artery of financial support and for most of us as individuals it is the most important vehicle through which each year we make our personal contribution to the community's welfare.

This year marks the 33rd year of Community Chest campaigns. The Community Chest has become a very familiar part of our community life and conscience, in some ways perhaps too familiar. For like many good things it is too easy to take for granted, too easy to regard as a sort of corporate entity divorced from the services and people for which it was created.

If the Community Chest idea is to continue to be successful, it cannot be thought of as just another, though important, agency in the community. Social agencies participating in the Chest do not belong to the Chest, the Chest belongs to them. The success of the Community Chest must be a part of the personal responsibility of each board and staff member.

The most difficult job we face, requiring our constant efforts, is the job of keeping the Community Chest a living thing; of preventing it from becoming in the minds of the giving public something of and by itself, separate from the services and people it represents. The danger lies in that the Community Chest may be thought of as just another form of tax collection or another way to prevent a socialized state, instead of a very true expression of a basic truth, that no part of the community is healthier than its weakest member.

The Chest must be a way *through* which we give, not *to* which we give. To keep the Chest alive and meaningful every child welfare agency must give freely and ungrudgingly of its time, its staff and its ideas. The task of raising money for the services to children cannot be delegated, in whole, to the staff members of the Chest. It is a part of the professional responsibility of every staff and board member of every agency in the community to translate the statistics of each Chest campaign—the money goal, the number of agencies represented—into people, into children. And it is not just a campaign-time responsibility but a day-by-day job that never ends.

We created Community Chests in America as a sensible economical way of raising funds for welfare and health agencies. It is still as effective a way as has been found but like any method that involves mutual responsibility, interrelatedness and good

faith, it requires our constant efforts and vigilance to make it succeed. It must be remembered that the Community Chest was not created just to economize on fund raising costs. It was created through the recognition that every social agency's need was relative and that the success of one agency was dependent upon the other. Strong, high-standard child welfare agencies need the support of strong family services, effective health services, character-building group work programs that are available to all children in the community. Federated financing and budgeting is a way in which a rounded community welfare program can be developed, and a way in which the relative needs of each agency can be weighed and a balance maintained in terms of community resources.

So in supporting our Chest campaigns this fall, we are not only obtaining funds for our personal interest, child welfare, but we are helping to finance the other aids to people in each community without which our own job would be infinitely more difficult and less effective.

By making sure that the public sees the child and the family behind the Red Feather to which it gives, we can make sure that the Red Feather remains indeed a symbol of the heart and conscience of our community.

Katharine F. Lenroot

With her retirement, Katharine Lenroot, one of the greatest friends of children all over the world, passes on the responsibilities for guiding the work of the U. S. Children's Bureau, to her well-known friend and associate, Dr. Martha M. Eliot.

The feelings of the staff and member agencies of the League were best expressed in a citation to Miss Lenroot on the occasion of her visit to her native state, Wisconsin, as the guest of the Midwest Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America, in June, 1951. The citation read as follows:

- "For being 'foster mother' to the children of our nation.
- "For her determination in bringing equal opportunities to all children.
- "For the high value she places on spiritual strengths in a child's life.
- "For her high place, both here and abroad, in lay and professional child welfare work.
- "For her courage, wisdom and vision as citizen and specialist.
- "For being a pioneer with the United States Children's Bureau since 1915 and for the last seventeen years of her hard and inspired work as Chief of the Bureau.
- "The Midwest Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America, meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 23rd day of June, 1951, gives to Katharine F. Lenroot, this award of merit, praying that her energy and high service will continue for many years to come."

NEW ADOPTION PAMPHLETS

A pamphlet, "Adoption Through a Licensed Agency," has been issued by the Children's Protective Association, 1907 S Street, N.W., Washington 9, D. C. The pamphlet contains papers by representatives of the professions of social work, psychiatry, psychology, medicine and law, based on practice in the adoption field, and is available at \$.35.

"A Follow-Up Study of Adoptive Families," a 151-page paper-covered book describing the results of a study conducted under the auspices of the Child Adoption Research Committee, 46 West 68th Street, New York City 23, is available at a cost of \$.50. The study examines 50 adoptive families in which placement was made by the Free Synagogue Child Adoption Committee of New York.

New League Member

Jewish Child Care Association of Essex County
15 Lincoln Park
Newark 2, New Jersey
Jacob L. Trobe, Executive Director

New League Provisionals

The Nursery Foundation of St. Louis
4950 Fountain Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri
Mrs. Clotild Ferguson, Executive Director
The South Side Day Nursery
1621 South 10th Street
St. Louis, Missouri
Mrs. Mildred Russell, Director
Welcome House
R.D. 3
Perkasie, Pennsylvania
Mrs. Richard J. Walsh, President

AWARD ANNOUNCED

The Virginia P. Robinson Award Committee of the Alumni Association of the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work has announced an award of \$500 for the manuscript of not less than 6000 words which best represents an original contribution in the fields of casework, supervision or social work education. Published or unpublished material, excluding textbooks, written within the past two years, may be submitted by individuals, agencies, or schools before December 31, 1951. Authors retain publishing rights. The award will be made in June, 1952. Those wishing further information should communicate with the Chairman of the Award Committee, Miss Mazie F. Rappaport, Department of Public Welfare, 327 St. Paul Place, Baltimore 2, Md.

NEW LEAGUE PUBLICATION

Just issued by the League is "Salary Practices—1951," a report of some salary practices in a selected group of League member agencies. The 18-page mimeographed booklet, edited by Henrietta L. Gordon, includes many tables and costs \$.35. As for all League publications, a discount of 10% will be given on quantities of 10 or more copies.

CONFERENCES

The Eastern Regional Conference will be held February 6, 7, 8, 1952, in Philadelphia, Pa. Headquarters will be the Sylvania Hotel. Mr. Walter P. Townsend, General Secretary, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, is chairman.

The Southern Regional Conference will be held March 13, 14, 15, 1952, in Raleigh, N. C. Headquarters will be the Sir Walter Hotel. Dr. Ellen B. Winston, State Department of Public Welfare, Atlanta, Ga., is chairman.

The Central Regional Conference will be held March 31 and April 1, 2, 1952, in Detroit, Mich. Headquarters will be the Statler Hotel. Mr. Fred R. Johnson, General Secretary, The Michigan Children's Aid Society, Detroit, is chairman.

The New England Regional Conference will be held June 9, 10, 1952, in Poland Springs, Maine. Miss Helen M. Wheeler, Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass., is chairman.

The Midwest Regional Conference will be held September 25, 26, 27, 1952, in Des Moines, Iowa. Headquarters will be the Hotel Savery. Mr. George Westby, Executive Director, Lutheran Welfare Society of Iowa, Des Moines, is chairman.

The South Pacific Regional Conference will be held in Long Beach, California, in 1952. Dates and headquarters have not been determined. Mr. Clyde S. Pritchard, Executive Secretary, Children's Bureau of Los Angeles, is chairman.

The Southwest Regional Conference will be held in Austin, Texas, in 1952. Dates and headquarters have not been determined. Miss Rosalind Giles, Director, Division of Child Care, State Department of Public Welfare, Austin, is chairman.

The National Conference of Social Work will be held May 25-30, in Chicago. Headquarters for the Child Welfare League of America will be the Congress Hotel. The League's program for National Conference in 1952 is being planned by a national committee which is working through regional subcommittees. Mrs. Nora Phillips Johnson, New York City, is national chairman; Miss Martha Branscombe, Chicago, is chairman for the Midwest subcommittee; and Mr. Clyde Getz, Los Angeles, chairman for the West Coast subcommittee.

A BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS

How a Women's Auxiliary Can Help Children

It is logical to suppose that an organized women's group could accomplish much toward the betterment of public child welfare programs. Our experience in Summit County, Ohio, has demonstrated, we believe, that a women's auxiliary board can indeed be helpful.

In our state, the County Child Welfare Boards of five members are responsible by law for all neglected and dependent children in need of public care. Four members are appointed by the county commissioners and the fifth is the judge of the juvenile court or his representative. At least one member of the board must be a woman.

Administering a program of such broad scope—including in our county over 800 children receiving either institutional or foster family care—is obviously a tremendous task.

Three and a half years ago in our county a women's auxiliary board to the Child Welfare Board was organized through the united efforts of the former executive secretary of the Child Welfare Board, the woman member of the Board, the first president of the Women's Auxiliary Board, and five other civic-minded women. Permission for such a group was obtained from the Child Welfare Board and a constitution was submitted for approval. Support of the local newspaper and the executive secretary of the Council of Social Agencies was secured. Seventy-five were invited to become members of this new group. The membership soon totaled over one hundred, and is now limited to one hundred and twenty-five. The group is highly representative, and there is a long waiting list. Every section of the county and most organizations are represented by talented women who are recognized leaders. The nucleus of this group came from women already doing volunteer work in the institution. A large number of these volunteers came from the Junior League, the Medical Auxiliary, and local churches.

The purpose of the Auxiliary Board is to aid in promoting a sound program for all children in the county under the care of the Child Welfare Board and to aid in interpreting this program in the community; to foster interest among the citizens of the county in the social, cultural, and educational development of the children; to promote volunteer service and encourage donations of private funds for use above and beyond the scope of public monies allocated by the county for the betterment of children.

A Men's Advisory Committee of civic-minded leaders in the community interested in child welfare

was formed to provide an interchange of ideas and advise on matters pertaining to the policies and the work of the organization.

The monthly programs have included addresses by the executives and members of the Child Welfare Board and the Social Service Department of the agency, as well as several nationally known authorities. When outside speakers were obtained, executives of all related agencies were invited. Some members of the Women's Auxiliary Board and of the League of Women Voters attend each monthly meeting of the Child Welfare Board. This audience has helped to provide a healthy stimulation.

When \$25,000 was raised through an auction and tombola just eight months after the Auxiliary Board was formed, it was the largest sum ever procured for charitable purposes by a women's group in the county. This definitely publicized the public child welfare program. Hundreds of individuals throughout the county, as well as the leaders in business and industry, were contacted.

An attractive pamphlet of facts and figures about the Child Welfare Board and its program was prepared and distributed to all volunteers of the agency, to all groups represented on the Auxiliary Board, and to all audiences whenever talks were made for the child welfare levy. Approximately two thirds of the cost of the child welfare program in our county is borne by a special levy of one-half mill, renewable by vote of the people every five years. Since public funds cannot legally be spent in a campaign for a levy, the Women's Auxiliary Board financed the printing of the pamphlets and addressed the folders sent to the voters.

The levy, though approved last November by 58 per cent of the voters, failed because the law then in effect required a 60 per cent favorable vote. The Women's Auxiliary Board is kept informed on all legislation pertaining to child welfare, and was active in support of a bill, passed by the Legislature at the last session and signed by the Governor, which reduces the requirement to a simple majority. Since the levy does not expire until the end of this year, and the people are to get another chance to vote on it in November, it is hoped that a disastrous cut in funds available for child welfare work will be avoided. The Women's Auxiliary Board is again taking a prominent part in the community campaign to get the levy renewed.

The women try to provide for the children some of the advantages their own children enjoy. Last year 11,143 volunteer hours were given to the agency. The volunteer committees provide drivers for the children and social workers; give switchboard service; collect clothing and do restyling and redecorating; and conduct classes in music, religious education, crafts, ceramics, dancing, art, library and charm for those children interested. Women unable to participate in volunteer activities go on the sustaining membership list and pay higher dues.

Besides responding to any call for assistance from the agency, the Women's Auxiliary Board sponsors three annual functions: a tea for volunteers, an open house for foster parents, and a party for employees. The agency, unable to use public funds for this purpose, is thus rendered a valuable service in public relations.

Several examples of organizational activities might be mentioned. Clippings of all newspaper articles on the Child Welfare Board and Women's Auxiliary Board and all related publicity have been assembled in a scrapbook by the historian. A vocational fund (founded to honor the former executive secretary) has been established to give financial aid to promising children. The funds necessary to purchase the Christmas gifts requested by each child are solicited annually throughout the community. The hospital and the dental clinic were completely redecorated and furnished with modern equipment, and a contagion ward established. A kindergarten for preschool children was begun, equipped, financed, and a teacher provided.

Perhaps the most worth-while contribution of the group was realized in the recent community-wide child welfare survey conducted by the Child Welfare League of America, which was initiated by the Women's Auxiliary Board. Moral support and a standing offer of financial aid encouraged the related agencies to participate in the survey. A favorable atmosphere was secured through personal contacts with key people, and the remaining financial aid was obtained. A resolution endorsing the survey and pledging support was made by ten of the leading women's organizations. In this way keener interest and greater participation in all phases of child welfare was created and stimulated.

The Women's Auxiliary Board has shown what an organized group of women with its interest focused on the welfare of children can accomplish in a public child welfare program. The significance of their services to the less fortunate children in the community speaks for itself.

Without the unusual cooperation of the former executive secretary, under whose guidance the group

was formed, these accomplishments would not have been possible. The ultimate goal is to have every resident of the county accept the responsibility implied in the Women's Auxiliary Board's motto: "These children are our children."

ELEANOR M. VOKE (MRS. EDWARD L.)

*President, The Women's Auxiliary Board
of the Summit County Children's Home, Akron, Ohio*

DIRECTORIES PUBLISHED

The first edition of the Service Directory of National Organizations has been published by the National Social Welfare Assembly. The comprehensive, 100-page directory is designed to show the purposes of 63 national public and voluntary agencies that are affiliated or associated with the Assembly, and particularly the kinds of services they give and the channels through which these services may be obtained by local communities. The directory costs \$1.25 for a single copy; \$1.00 for five or more, and may be obtained from the N.S.W.A., 1790 Broadway, New York City.

* * *

The 1951 Directory of Vocational Counseling Agencies has been published by the National Vocational Guidance Association, and is available at \$1.00 a copy from the Ethical Practices Committee of the Association, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

LONG TIME TEMPORARY PLACEMENT

(Continued from page 9)

whether we have an impression that mental ability is inherited. All of these devices are helpful in aiding us to use the knowledge and skill we have without bias and prejudice.

In terms of coming to a better understanding of what is really involved in this problem of long time temporary placement, I am aware of the theoretical nature of the observations I have made concerning the case I described and the relationship between extended foster care for young babies and later mental ability. However, I believe that only as we are willing to use such observations in practice, and continue reporting and sharing our experience with them, can we know how far this may be true. Only in this way can the results of any research observations be tested and so pave the way for further research and understanding.

CLASSIFICATION PLAN AND SALARY SCALE FOR TEACHERS IN DAY CARE CENTERS

The teacher in the day care center holds the key to the child's ability to benefit from the program. In order to attract and retain teaching staff of high caliber, two Milwaukee agencies have developed a sound salary plan. At a time when shortage of trained teaching personnel is nationwide, and rapidly becoming more acute, such a plan should be of interest to many communities.

A JOINT personnel study committee of Child Care Centers, Inc., and The Volunteers of America Day Nursery of Milwaukee, Wisconsin,* was established in May, 1949, to work out problems in teacher staffing of common concern to these day care centers. Both agencies were confronted by their inability to secure and retain good, well-trained teachers in the field of nursery education, and both had a desire to improve teaching and program standards within the scope of their service.

Because of the long day spent by children in day care centers, and the special needs of children from broken homes, it is essential that the best available staff be obtained, giving due consideration to the fact that a large part of the support of these day care services comes from Community Chest funds. With these factors in mind, the committee considered the following reasons for the need of setting up a definite salary scale, based on educational requirements and experience, sufficiently high to attract qualified teachers.

1. In hiring teachers, one must go into a highly competitive field at this time—one in which every public school system has a definite salary scale to offer.
2. Nursery schools should have a teacher with a specialized degree—a B.S. in education is less than the standard which should be required. Comparatively few institutions offer the B.S. in nursery education, Milwaukee State Teachers College being the only one in Wisconsin which does.
3. All qualified nursery school teachers are also qualified kindergarten teachers, for whom there is a large demand in the school systems. It is also true that there is a particularly large turnover in this class of teachers, since they are most often young, attractive and marriageable.

* Members of the Personnel Study Committee were as follows: Dr. Lee H. Mathews, *Chairman*, State Teachers College; Mrs. Theodore Griggs, *Board Member*, Child Care Centers; Rev. Reinhart B. Gutmann, *Dir.*, Neighborhood House; Frank Hughes, *Pres.*, Vol. of Am. Day Nursery; Mrs. Helen Lehman, *Exec. Secy.*, Child Care Centers; Paul H. Nolte, *Exec. Secy.*, Vol. of Am. Day Nursery; Dr. William W. Theisen, *Assistant Superintendent*, Milwaukee Public Schools; Margaret Thornhill, *Adv. Member*, Associate Secy., Casework Division, Community Welfare Council.

4. The average number of teaching days in public schools is 190 days (usually less in private schools). The number of teaching days in day care centers is 219 days. It was felt that there must be some compensation for this differential in time required. The fact that teaching hours per day in day care centers are usually longer than those required for kindergarten teachers was also recognized, but not taken into consideration in arriving at salaries.

In making the original salary study, material was received and compared from the cities of Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Minneapolis, from the Child Welfare League of America, and from the school systems of Milwaukee and surrounding communities. Because there was such a wide variance in the ranges around the country, the committee felt it must realistically give first consideration to the school systems in the county, which draw on the same sources of teachers as do the day care centers.

This salary scale (Schedule A), as drawn up and adopted by the two agencies, was effective in improving the staff situation. However, after two years' experience in attempting to achieve these standards and hold to them, it was found that the scale had certain limitations, and it became necessary to reactivate the committee. The Neighborhood House, also employing nursery school teachers, was invited to participate.

For the following reasons the committee felt it necessary to revise the earlier schedule:

1. The 1949 schedule was not flexible enough to give adequate salaries to teachers who had graduated from schools for nursery teachers but did not have a Bachelor's degree with a major in Nursery Education. These teachers could not advance beyond \$2800 a year. This limitation on salaries payable to staff not having the B.S. in Nursery Education makes it difficult to employ and hold teachers who have qualifications other than the Nursery Education degree.
2. The former plan was based upon Milwaukee State Teachers College requirements for a degree in Nursery Education. This plan did not permit compensation commensurate with specialized training for graduates of other schools, and this created resentment.

3. The general increase in cost of living and in salaries in public schools and other fields has left the agencies behind in their pay policies. Whereas it was not planned to have salaries equal to those of public schools, the discrepancy is now too great.
4. The 1949 plan offers little inducement to continue one's education, and the new plan should allow for a gradual reclassification as a staff member becomes more qualified through further study.

It is felt that the cooperation and mutual understanding of the various agencies will increase as we adhere to joint standards; therefore each agency has agreed to abide by the provisions of this new classification system. The annual salary increase of \$150 or

\$200, as listed, will be a maximum to each teacher and will be granted if satisfactory work and evidence of growth are shown through study of the teacher's performance, including work with children, teacher-parent relationships, in-service education, general agency responsibilities and community relationships. The teacher will be asked to participate in this evaluation.

Differences between Schedule A, currently being used by the day care agencies, and the Proposed Schedule B, can be followed on the comparative chart. Changes and reasons are listed below.

<i>Change</i>	<i>Reason</i>
1. More classifications have been provided.	1. Recognition is given to increased training and experience, with incentive to get more education.
2. Assistant teachers in Schedule B can get less increment for fewer years.	2. Further incentive to continue education.
3. Categories overlap.	3. Eliminates sharp degrees of variance for a few educational credits. Allows teacher in lower category with valuable experience to be salaried above new graduate with no experience.
4. Increment is increased to \$150 and \$200.	4. Increment of \$100 is almost negligible under present economy and will not keep valuable teachers. For instance, \$100 increment was lost with tax increase of October 1, 1950.
5. Credit for Master's degree has been increased to \$200.	5. Increment of \$100 was not sufficient compensation for the additional training required for a Master's degree, nor was it incentive for work necessary to obtain Master's degree.
6. Credit for head teaching position is increased to \$200.	6. Credit of \$100 was insufficient compensation for additional responsibilities of head teacher.
7. There is little variance in maximum salaries.	7. Factor is balanced as teacher will be able to reach maximum at earlier date.

PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATION AND SALARY SCHEDULE

Experience in years	SCHEDULE A					Head Teacher Add \$100 to other class	Ed. Supervisor Add \$250 to Head Teacher
	B. A. degree—not specified	Bachelor's degree in Nursery Ed.	Master's degree in field				
0	\$2200	\$2800	\$2900				
1	2300	2900	3000				
2	2400	3000	3100				
3	2500	3100	3200				
4	2600	3200	3300				
5	2700	3300 (May)	3400				
6	2800 (May)		3500				
7			3600				
8			3700				
9			3800				
10			3900	\$4000 (May)	\$4250 (May)		

Experience in years	PROPOSED SCHEDULE B						
	Asst. Teacher I Bach. degree 0-9 credits in Nursery Ed. or Child Dev.	Asst. Teacher II Bach. degree 10-20 credits in Nursery Ed. or Child Dev.	Teacher I Bach. degree 21-31 credits in Nursery Ed. or Child Dev.	Teacher II Bach. degree 32 credits in Nursery Ed. or Child Dev.	Master's degree in field	Head Teacher Add \$100 to other class	Ed. Supervisor Add \$250 to Head Teacher
0	\$2400	\$2550	\$2700	\$2900	\$3100		
1	2550	2700	2900	3100	3300		
2	2700	2850	3100	3300	3500		
3	2850 (May)	3000 (May)	3300	3500	3700		
4			3500	3700	3900		
5			3700 (May)	3900 (May)	4100	\$4300 (May)	\$4550 (May)

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

California Citizens Look at Adoption

A GROUP of interested citizens held a two-day planning conference in September, 1949, initiated by the adoption agencies in San Francisco to explore ways of determining what type of adoption program will best serve and protect the rights and interests of the three parties involved in the adoption process—the child, its natural parents and its adoptive parents. It was the consensus of this conference that the people of this state were concerned with the human problems involved in adoption and were ready, if shown the way, to assume their community responsibility. The Citizens Committee on Adoption of Children in California was therefore organized and underwritten for a period of two years by grants from the Columbia and Rosenberg Foundations in San Francisco.

The Committee presently consists of some 52 members who reside in 17 different counties throughout the state. Six members are professional social workers and the others include doctors, lawyers, judges, religious and educational leaders, labor union representatives, representatives of welfare departments, and citizens representative of such groups as the PTA, League of Women Voters, other women's groups, service organizations and the like. The Committee's primary purpose may be expressed as follows: to determine what the citizens of the state of California consider to be and will accept as a sound adoption program. It was felt that the only way this question could be honestly answered would be to place all the facts, criticisms and differences of opinion relating to existing adoption practices before the citizens of the entire community and have them come up with their own answers.

To this end, some eleven local county adoption committees have been organized in counties in which over three fourths of the adoptions in the state of California were completed last year. Each of these local committees is autonomous but is affiliated with the State Citizens Committee through the membership of its chairman on the State Committee. These local committees range in size from 10 to 25 members in some of the smaller counties to over 100 members in Los Angeles County.

These local committees have involved their memberships in an investigation of what is involved in an adoption. For example, who is the child in need of adoption services, where is he and how can these services be made available to him? This question has assumed great importance throughout the state these past few years because of the repeated charges that

our institutions are bursting with children who are available for adoption. In order to test the accuracy of this statement, seven of the county committees, together with the child care agencies, undertook to review the case histories of all of the children in their respective communities who were in care outside of their own homes—in institutions or foster homes. This study covered well in excess of 50 per cent of all of the children in the state of California who are in care away from their homes.

There has not yet been time to digest and weigh the results of this study or to determine just what conclusions it will support. However, it is safe to say there were found to be an infinitesimal number of children in institutions or foster homes who could be said to be adoptable today. It is true there were a substantial number who might be adoptable if—and at the moment it is an insurmountable if—there were more adequate child welfare services available to serve these children. These were the hard-to-place children, the older child, the child of minority or mixed racial background, and the child with physical or emotional handicaps. Certainly these children might be adoptable if there were services available which could find homes for them and could provide the social work services necessary to move the child from his present status into adoption. As a result of this study, the community is becoming really conscious for the first time that there are such children, that adequate child welfare services are not presently available to serve them, and further, that had there been such adequate services during the last ten or fifteen years, perhaps many of these children might now be in adoptive homes, not only to the great benefit of the child but also to the financial benefit of the community, in that the child would no longer be on relief rolls.

Another question being studied is the services available to the mother, both married and unmarried, in the way of financial, hospital, medical, counseling and maternity home services. The state and local committees, as part of their study and action program, were successful in mobilizing citizen support that secured the defeat of legislation intended to eliminate public assistance to unwed mothers under California's Aid to Needy Children Program. Both state and local committees are continuing to direct their efforts to enhance and develop responsible community services in this area.

Likewise, these groups are taking a look at agency adoption practices, to see to what extent they give the necessary protection and security to the three parties involved in an adoption, what the objections and criticisms in the community of those agency services are at present and how they can be improved.

Are there misconceptions in the community as to what an adoption agency does, and if so, how can these misconceptions be corrected?

Again, the various local committees are taking a look at independent adoptions to determine what protections are afforded in this type of placement, and what, if any, additional protections should be afforded.

The one thing which has been noticed in the course of these community discussions is that individuals who began with diametrically opposed viewpoints have, in the course of these discussions, begun to find a common understanding in relation to the problem of children and parents involved in an adoption. While it is true that differences of opinion will always remain, it is becoming increasingly apparent that through the work of the committees these differences are being narrowed, and basic agreements are being strengthened in respect to sound adoption and related child care services. It is our job as citizens to interpret to our communities just what agency services are, so that our agency program can be improved and expanded to provide the maximum service and protection to each child, each natural parent and each adoptive parent in every adoption placement.

WESLEY G. LA FEVER

*President, Children's Home Society of California; and
President, Citizens Committee on Adoption of Children in California*

BOOK NOTE

PHILANTHROPIC GIVING, by F. Emerson Andrews. Russell Sage Foundation, New York. 1950. 318 pp. \$3.00

This excellent compendium of information on giving in the United States grew out of requests from donors for advice and provides an extremely well written, thorough and accurate account of who gives, how much and for what purposes. Full recognition is given to the extent to which the basic needs of man are now being met by governmental expenditures for welfare, now nine times the voluntary giving for purposes which, a generation ago, lay wholly within the field of private charity.

Noteworthy is an analysis of the 1943 income tax returns revealing that the lowest income groups (under \$3,000) provide 60% of private philanthropy, and contribute at a rate higher than the average of all other groups of donors.

Significant roles in present day giving are now being filled by labor, with 25% of Chest contributions coming from employee groups; and by corporations, which in 1950 gave 40% of all contributions to Community Chests. Business has taken the place of big income givers. In the past few years philanthropic giving has amounted to four billion dollars a year,

representing about 2% of the gross personal income. It is about the same as the amount spent on tobacco and less than half that spent on alcoholic beverages.

Private American giving overseas in comparison to governmental grants is seen as significant in respect to (1) ready adaptation to particular needs, (2) capacity for immediate response, (3) means of bringing Americans into personal contact with needs of other countries. In 1948, 43 voluntary agencies spent 156 millions in this way. But more important than the dollars—"In a world that desperately needs friendship and understanding across national boundaries, this (is) bread cast upon the waters."

As compared with endowments for limited purposes, the "foundation" with wide freedom of action is a new and typically American institution. There are 48 of these with endowments of 10 millions or more. The largest in the world is the Ford Foundation with assets of over 248 millions. The number of foundations with substantial endowments is given at about 1,000, with assets of 2.6 billions and annual expenditures of 133 millions. Foundations are increasingly seeing their role as providing the "venture capital" of philanthropy for long range, complex projects that do not usually appeal to individual givers. However, concentration is on noncontroversial fields of education, welfare and health. Only 19 are in the fields of government and public administration, and the same number, less than 6%, in the whole field of economics. "Foundation boards are not immune to the discomfort of this, though a few courageously undertake controversial studies."

To voluntary agencies, Mr. Andrews says, remains the important task of (1) filling the gaps and inadequacies of the public agencies' coverage of basic economic, health and educational needs, (2) establishing standards and checking work of public agencies, (3) covering any additional needs, and (4) doing most of the exploratory, experimental and research work, particularly in the field of prevention.

In respect to the problem of "overhead" as the donor sees it, the author wisely points out that, although it needs to be seriously examined to discover charity rackets and inefficient administration, yet the contributor should realize that a service which rehabilitates a family, making it self-supporting, is an overhead cost vastly cheaper in the long run than direct relief.

Health constitutes one of the largest fields of voluntary giving—300 millions in 1947. The vast proportion of this goes to national agencies through annual campaigns in which distribution is largely according to the "heart appeal" of the cause and the skill of the fund raiser. More effort is needed, Mr. Andrews says, to broaden the field of fund raising, set

goals according to need, and allocate more funds for research in the cause, cure and prevention of illness.

Charity rackets that capitalize on appealing causes to make money for the promoters take in, in New York City alone, 50 millions a year. The national take is probably about 100 millions. Though only 3% of the philanthropic dollar, it does represent the annual spending of all endowed foundations and adversely affects public confidence in and support of all philanthropies. Defense against this evil can be found in information agencies to advise and inform prospective donors, such as the Contributors Information Bureau in New York City; and in local, state and federal laws requiring a license to raise funds. Laws in effect at present do not cover mail appeals, and religious exemptions constitute a dangerous loophole where, as in New York, any seven persons can band together and declare themselves a religious corporation.

In discussing the financing of research, Mr. Andrews points out that scientific research, which has had such spectacular results in the physical sciences, has not been comparably applied to social problems. "The increasing gap between skill in handling materials and ability to deal with human relations," he writes,

"constitutes a cultural lag that threatens catastrophe." Vastly more social research is imperatively needed and adequate financing of this is fundamental, because all modern research, whatever the field, requires the handling of mass data, teams of investigators, and costly equipment. However, of the 11 billions spent annually on all research by government, universities and industry, only 6% goes into social research.

The reviewer asks the question: Are Americans generous? In 1949 the family gave \$97, or 2% of its income, for philanthropy. The increase this represents is not impressive when viewed in the light of other expenditures, as \$111 for tobacco, \$218 for alcoholic beverages, and \$376 Federal tax for national defense. In concluding the author declares, "The philanthropist of the past looked about him with keen eye and sympathetic heart and gave to meet the needs he saw. The philanthropist of today must also look ahead with an informed mind and a warm imagination, and with new tools help build the world that is to be."

REV. ROBERT D. SMITH

*Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Relations
Diocese of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.*

CLASSIFIED AD SERVICE

Insertion of five lines of six words each is made at the minimum rate of \$2.50. For each additional line, or a fraction thereof, the charge is 50 cents. Closing date is the eighth of the month prior to the month of issue. A check should accompany the order.

CASEWORKER: Immediate opening for graduate of accredited school of social work for Roman Catholic adoption agency with growing program. Good personnel practices and psychiatric consultation. Salary \$3000-\$3900, depending on training and experience. Write Holy Family Adoption Service, 158 N. Occidental Blvd., Los Angeles 26, Calif.

CHILD WELFARE WORKERS for CWLA, FWAA and APWA member agency. Salary starting at \$245 or \$268, depending on training and experience. Denver Bureau of Public Welfare, 777 Cherokee St., Denver, Colo.

OPENING FOR CASEWORKER in nonsectarian voluntary institution offering a casework service to emotionally disturbed children and their parents. Psychiatric treatment also available to children. Qualifications master's degree in social work plus experience in working with parent-child relationships. Good personnel experience. Institution is part agency also offering foster home and adoption services. For full information write Children's Services of Connecticut, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

SUPERVISOR in adoption program with opportunity for development and refinement of skills under psychiatric consultation. Good salary. Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, 1122 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

CASEWORKER—To carry small caseload of disturbed children in foster homes and institutions under excellent supervision and psychiatric consultation. Opportunity for development of intensive treatment skills. Good salary. Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, 1122 N. Dearborn St., Chicago 10, Ill.

SUPERVISOR and CASEWORKER for special services to children in merged family and children's program. Opportunity for growth and advancement through variety casework experience and supervisory experience. Salaries commensurate with experience and in line with prevailing scales. Family & Children's Service, 346 W. Jefferson, Ft. Wayne 2, Ind.

CASEWORK SUPERVISOR, institution for children. Good personnel policies, salary \$4200-\$4800 depending on qualifications. Write Methodist Children's Home, Selma, Ala.

CASEWORKER, private multiple-function family and child care agency. Completed professional training and experience in the children's field required. Salary range \$3630-\$4026. Jewish Social Service Agency, 1131 Spring Rd., N.W., Washington, D. C.

SUPERVISOR with psychiatric orientation to supervise houseparents and assist director in program planning in small treatment institution for disturbed children. Good salary. Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, 1122 N. Dearborn St., Chicago 10, Ill.

CASEWORKER with graduate training and experience, for private children's institution. Duties: intake, child study and counseling parents. Salary dependent on experience. Write The Children's Home, c/o Mrs. W. H. Kohl, 1921 Bever Ave., S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED CASEWORKER for progressive Baptist children's institution in Chicago area. Salary range \$3000-\$3600. Excellent personnel practices. Provisional member CWLA. Write L. B. Snider, Executive Director, Central Baptist Children's Home, Box 117, Lake Villa, Ill.